DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 129 IR 005 956

TITLE	The Changing Role in Children's Work in Public Libraries. Issues & Answers.
INSTITUTION	Detroit Public Library, Mich.
PUB DATE	16 Jun 77
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Detroit Public Library, 5201 Woodward, Detroit, Michigan 48202 ($2.50, while supply lasts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; *Children; Futures (of Society); Interagency Cooperation; *Librarians; Library Circulation; Library Education; Library Materials; Library Material Selection; *Library Services; *Public Libraries; Standards; *Trend Analysis; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The five papers in this collection were presented to a group of Directors and Coordinators of Children's Work representing large, medium, and county public libraries, as well as representatives from state libraries and library schools, who attended the President's Preconference. Topics presented include (1) a review of the development of children's librarianship and major trends in this century; (2) a discussion of the current literature on the field; (3) the role of supervisors and coordinators in the development of children's services and ways to meet the threat posed by a tendency to strengthen central libraries at the expense of branches; (4) the findings of a study in which librarians ranked the desirability of such trends as emphasis on materials through increased use of paperbacks, non-book materials, or electronic devices; cooperation with other agencies serving children; and emphasis on meeting recreational rather than curricular needs; (5) the changing role or function of the central children's library in 27 urban libraries in the United States and two in Canada that were studied; and (6) areas for research, such as the attitudes, training, and concerns of the children's librarian; knowledge and understanding of the organization out of which the children's library operates; and the children themselves. Recommendations to the profession reported by eight discussion groups which met following the presentations are included. (MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Directors and Coordinators of Children's Work, representing large, medium and county public libraries were invited, as a team, to attend the President's Preconference. Also included were representatives from state libraries and library schools. Registered attendance, excluding guests and visitors, was 88. The goal of the Preconference was: To identify trends in management's organization and planning that are weakening library service to children.

Following the morning program, participants were assigned a discussion group. The major points, as reported from each group, is entitled Recommendations to the Profession. Barbara Rollock's closing remarks conclude the program.

PROGRAM

Keynote Speaker: SARA FENWICK, Professor Emeritus, Ann Arbor, Michigan
"Rescuing 'The Nightingale'"

F. WILLIAM SUMMERS, University of South Carolina
"Take This Coal and Go Make a Hell of Your Own" --
Children's Services and Library Administrators

Research Findings: MARY KINGSBURY, The University of North Carolina

MAE BENNE, University of Washington, Seattle
"Travels with Three Questionnaires"

MARGARET MARY KIMMEL, University of Pittsburgh

Group Workshop Sessions: RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROFESSION

Summation: BARBARA ROLLOCK, New York Public Library

This Report published August 1977 by the Detroit Public Library.

RESCUING THE "NIGHTINGALE"

Sara Innis Fenwick

President's Preconference
June 16, 1977

I am honored to have been invited to speak to this audience on this occasion. The professional concerns that form the focus of your deliberations today are of the utmost importance to the entire library world, the audience invited to consider them is ideal.

I must share, also, a very personal pleasure in the sound of the title of my remarks. The "nightingale", is an expression of that ideal that has become well-known to some of us from one of the essays in Frances Clarke Sayers' collection, Summoned By Books (Viking, 1965). In that writing, which was titled, "Lose Not the Nightingale" she used the story of the "Emperor's Nightingale" to interpret the role of the children's librarian thus: "Children's librarians have chosen to be a medium between children and the written word. We like [the Emperor of China] belong to a privileged class, with as great an inheritance as his, with as much responsibility and variety in our lives..." "Like him, we have heard the nightingale." That nightingale has acquired many ruffled feathers in his long mythological life, and I am not intending to use him as a symbol this morning - either in Mrs. Sayers' sense, or as a peg on which to hang my thoughts, but he will be singing somewhere offstage and you may hear him in the course of the day.

I should make a few explanations and apologies for my own style. I shall be using the pronoun our from habit. My experience has allowed me to work in public libraries, in schools and in library education institutions, I continue to share the concerns and the hopes that we have had, even though I shall be starting my third attempt at retirement in August. I suspect that I will be guilty of taking advantage of my gray hair to express some strong opinions and in a more than accustomed hortatory tone; I apologize for this in advance to some extent, but I sincerely apologize for what will inevitably be lapses in the use of he and she. Never mind, I promise to clean them up before submitting a copy of these remarks.

With this audience in front of me I have no need to perform the usual keynote speaker's function of reporting a systematic literature search and summary. You have identified very well your major concerns in planning this conference. In this introduction I shall be doing little more than touching upon some high spots in our professional experience, sharing some opinions that seem important to me, and asking some questions.

I think that what I really want to talk about is style, the style of serving our audience, the style we see in ourselves, and perhaps the style that some of our co-workers see in us. Since we cannot think about style without considering change, we must also consider those characteristics that have been constants and those that have been in a state of evolving over many years. To pick up those constants it will be useful to take a brief backward look.

Digging about in the centennial of our professional existence was a reminder that children's librarians did not even exist as a sub-species of the profession a hundred years ago; but children did; and they had been knocking on library doors, sitting in reading rooms, asking to read and to borrow books, and eventually winning the right to be recognized. Because they were omni-present on the library scene, the two concerns that have been constants in our professional dialogues surfaced in the

first year of the American Library Association's organization. This, you will know was in the special section added to a report from the U.S. Bureau of Education by the author, Wm. I. Fletcher, the section titled "Public Libraries and the Young". To quote:

> The lack of appreciation of youthful demands for culture is one of the saddest chapters in the history of the world's comprehending not the light which comes into it. Our public libraries will fail in an important part of their mission if they shut out from their treasures minds craving the best, and for the best purposes, because, forsooth, the child is too young to read good books. (U.S. Bureau of Education. "Public Libraries and the Young". Special Report, pt. 1, Public Libraries in the United States of America. [Wash. D.C. U.S.G.P.O. 1876] 412.)

This issue of responsibility for service to youth, and the equally basic concern for quality of reading matter made available, continued to be raised and given strong and continuous voice at the earliest national conferences by an increasing number of Association leaders, with Caroline Hewins, Librarian of the Hartford Public Library in the forefront. Her "Report on Reading for the Young" in 1894 spoke of the need - not only to abolish age restrictions, but to provide special rooms for children, with designated attendants to provide service. We recognize the Attendants as an early notice of our embryonic existence.

Further evidence of the early recognition of the "attendant" is in a lovely paragraph in a "Report of the Examining Committee of the Boston Public Library in 1895":

> The children's room should be the most important place in the city for the training of those readers without whom the Library is a mere ornament, or at best a convenience for scholars, instead of the nursery of good citizenship which it was meant to be. In the opinion of your committee, no time should be lost in filling the shelves of this room with books, and in providing the most adequate guidance for their use. Advantage should be taken of the newly awakened interest in the Library building which is now bringing many children to it from curiosity, and they should be lured by every legitimate device to stay there for reading. (Public Library of the City of Boston. Annual Report of the Trustees, 1895 [City Document No.18] [Bost. Rockwell & Churchill, 1896] 49).

And more about those Attendants from Mary Wright Plummer, Director of Pratt Institute Library, in a paper read before the Friends Library Assoc. of Philadelphia and the New York Library Club, in 1897, in which she testified, after summing up the requisites of a good children's library, that:

> if there is on the library staff an assistant well read and well educated, broadminded, tactful, with common sense and judgment, attractive to children in manner and person, possessed, in short, of all desirable qualities, she should be taken from wherever she is, put into the children's library, and paid enough to keep her there. There is no more important work in the building, no more delicate critical work than that with children, no work that pays so well in immediate as well as in far-off results... Alice I. Hazeltine, Library Work with Children (H.W. Wilson, 1917) 81.

These standards became children's librarians in more than designation, and developed one of the early specializations in librarisnship. It was eventually based upon a professional education that was designed particularly for that purpose -

beginning with the Training School in the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh in 1901. This school, started by Frances J. Olcott, enrolled students from all parts of the country, and until 1917 prepared children's librarians exclusively.

The development of these first children's librarians was fostered not only in the acquisition of special skills and knowledge in professional training, but was kept active and growing in the annual conferences of the ALA where a Children's Librarians' Section was formed in 1901, to serve as a forum for discussions, and as a channel for communication between conferences. The history of this subdivision of the ALA and its several metamorphoses is an interesting chapter in itself for the evidence of its impact, or sometimes lack of impact, upon the Association as a whole but not a story that we can follow at this time.

Let us, rather, keep our eyes on the "attendants" as we skip in and out of weeks and over years.

In the first three decades of this century the children's librarians had become identified as serving a group of library users - a part of the public library's legitimate clientele, and users who were recognized, together with the foreign-born and the blind readers, as most deserving of the Association's special concern, as described by Peggy Sullivan in her life of Carl Milam. (Peggy Sullivan. Carl Milam and the American Library Association. [Wilson, 1976] 20). The children's librarians were able to build upon the skills and knowledge in their background a specialization, and during these twenty to thirty years they would initiate and experiment with methods for collection building, reference work, reading guidance and public relations that would form the basis of children's library service for this century. This was a period of creativity and invention that earned the classic description of the American Public Library Children's Rooms in Paul Hazard's Books Children and Men (Horn Book, 1944). Elizabeth Nesbitt has described the important aspects of this specialization as including the establishment of children's service on a departmental basis and extending throughout the branches, developing the criteria by which literature for children was evaluated, establishing relationships with a variety of community groups serving youth, producing essential bibliographical aids, developing the many group and individual methods of reading guidance. (Elizabeth Nesbitt, "Library Service to Children", Library Trends 3:118 [Oct. 1954]).

Even before the beginning of the new century a third profession-wide concern was demanding the attention of the public library. While children's librarians and administrators were responding to the increasing audience for books and the guidance of children in their reading, they were communicating their concern for a definition of the library's responsibility to the public schools. In the beginning the attitude generally was that the most appropriate book service for children would be that provided by teachers, using book loans in the classroom. However, reports from a majority of libraries, written both before and after the turn of the century recognized the extent and character of the special services to schools, and continued to view this service to a community institution as part of their responsibility. It is also evident that the level of concern increased with the volume of reference work, the lack of teacher-training in the use of library resources, the criticism of teachers' assignments - familiar problems of last week. You may remember an article by Dorothy Broderick discussing the continuity of these problems, and citing 5 articles relating to them, all published between 1895 and 1901. The first action taken by the library profession to bring some recognition of the legitimate school needs was that of John Cotton Dana in 1898 when he brought to the N.E.A. a petition requesting the creation of a library department in that organization. This action resulted in a committee study and the formation of a Library Department in N.E.A., and recommended some guidelines for more

productive cooperation. In the years since then a variety of administrative patterns for the provision of library resources in schools continued to evolve and to develop into the media center of today's schools. The concern for a definition of who is responsible for what service has continued to be another of our inherited concerns, and periodically, has occupied too much professional communication, space, and executive time and emotion.

An historic note of interest ought not be overlooked by this audience is that the very early pioneer librarians who were taking the concerns for needs of children to the floor of the national association meetings, to the executive meetings, and to the pages of Library Journal were not "children's library attendants"; they were the library administrators and leaders in the profession, and they proved to be powerful advocates.

These are all notes from our early history, and they may seem irrelevant to present problems, but we can recognize that many of our organizational patterns and relationships have their origins in administrative decisions of the past. There is not only a continuity of concerns and issues that make up the everyday constraints under which children's librarians work today, but there is, happily, a heartening continuity of the ideals and the creativity that should give us courage to look for new solutions in this era.

In the second quarter of this century, years covering the so-called Great Depression, the Second World War and the Post-war adjustment, libraries, and especially children's services, were in a holding pattern. Our style did not change much except that efforts were continuous to reach children in all parts of the country with a variety of services. It was a period of gradual, steady development, adapting to special needs during times of national crisis, incorporating some of these adaptations in ongoing programs, consolidating gains, and standardizing patterns of organization so that by mid-century there was a general recognition of the goals of children's library service in the public library. Many of the professional journals, notably Library Journal, carried articles directed toward this end of giving voice to representative statements of a philosophy of children's work. Harriet Long's Rich the Treasure (ALA 1953) became the most quoted summary of these expressions, and the success of the efforts of half a century were recognized in our favorite quotation for Dr. Robert Leigh's Library Inquiry.

This was our style, and it was a good style. It served well at least 25% of the children in the nation, and it reached more than 50%. It was a style that addressed itself knowledgeably and well to the book-related needs of the individual child, and to the adults who worked with children. There was, however, on the heels of the mid-century, an acceleration of changes in the social and economic life of the whole population, and these changes would affect the style of our communications, our organizations, and the perception of library services by both practitioners and public.

These changes need not be documented, but it is important to recognize that probably the source of greatest change in the environment of our users was in the school. Changes in the school curricula, in methods of instruction, in the school calendar, and in the technical developments that revolutionized communications and learning resources were the outgrowth of a decade of serious and long-overdue criticism of the effectiveness of teaching and learning as practiced.

A brief and cursory scanning of some aspects of the responses of school librarians to these changes suggests some action programs for consideration. On the national stage, the professional organization of school librarians, by this time the American

Association of School Librarians, had developed written standards which, while they were largely quantitative until 1960, served as guides for discussion with accrediting offices at the state and regional level. From these offices there were evaluation guides with which to examine the provision of resources and staff, and the relation of the library services to the goals of the entire school. The organizations of school librarians had developed some strong leadership at local, state and national levels who had for a long time identified their relationship with educators and with the school as an institution. School librarians were urged to be active in a variety of educational organizations where they could be made aware of developments in teaching-learning objectives in the different subject areas, and where they could contribute information concerning the materials for study, and the school library's role in program planning. The development and improvement of school libraries was given a tremendous infusion of public and professional interest with three funded planning projects and demonstrations, and these provided opportunities for strengthening of relationships, data gathering, involvement of administrators and board members, as well as community members. Through carefully planned and prepared communications the spotlight was turned upon the needs and the potential of the school media center. It should also be understood that the basic dimensions and goals for these projects existed long before the possibility for funding was even mentioned. They were the subject of dreams and things-hoped-for, but also the products of long and serious dialogues among the Association leadership.

I have dwelt upon the experience of our fellow librarians in the school field because I believe there are some aspects of their experience that children's librarians in public libraries, acting both as individuals and as organization members and officers, have and might continue to consider. As a matter of fact, that is, in part, what I have assumed this workshop was organized to consider - under an organization plan of its own. The gathering of data about the status of library services, the drafting of specific plans for spotlighting good patterns of service in individual libraries, and in library systems, the designing of experimental and creative programs of service you would like to see implemented, and the identification of channels and forms of making these actions known through all the channels of professional communication that can be touched are among the most positive steps that can be taken.

There are two roles that it seems to me the children's librarian must assume in today's political and social scene - that of educator and that of manager.

The Children's Services Coordinator becomes the front line library educator in defining and interpreting the public library's role in the total community responsibility to the library needs of youth. In the many relationships implied by this role our style of communication is in constant need of re-examination; it can be bolstered by maintaining a familiarity with professional journals in the education field, by attending of meetings of educators at local and national levels, and by being continually visible in local schools and educational activities. This is not a new role, but it is a demanding one and is probably the only route by which we become productively a part of the community's overall commitment to better education. Public library responsibilities for services to schools have undergone very great changes since the profession's early recognition of the problems involved; they will continue to change, but those changes should not find children's librarians unprepared, it should find us helping to plan for a more coordinated community-wide service. This is a more important concern today than trying to identify and describe separate but equal roles to be played.

Perhaps it will be easier for children's librarians to assume this role if they are perceived, and perceive themselves as part of the decision making structure of the public library. I recognize that the basis for this status is not solely in our hands, but the perception begins with the recognition by the children's librarians that they

are, first of all, public librarians, with a responsibility to the total community in that role, and to their co-workers in their daily relationships. I like the way Ruth Gregory expressed these responsibilities in an article in Illinois Libraries (58 [Dec. 1976] 796) "Realities in Library Work with Children"

> A constant but relatively unheralded responsibility of a children's librarian in the last decade of the 20th century is to resist the mediocre and to plan and work for the highest possible level of excellence in materials and services. The concept of excellence in library services is a professional goal held in common by administrators, children and adult services staff. Excellence is not an ideal dream. It is a real possibility when the training, the experience, and the unique specialties of all are coordinated to work for the best, not just the ordinary. .....Librarians who serve children do not work in a little world of their own! unless someone keeps them there by design of oversight. They have begun to take their place as indispensable partners in the emerging transformation of the public library into a vital center of intellectual, informational and cultural resources for the community.

It has been greatly encouraging that people in this group who have been active in leadership roles in the Children's Services Division have also assumed responsibilities in the Public Library Association. The particular structure of ALA in our present organization chart does not provide for children's librarians to have a platform for their own, and I have continued to think that this is wise, even when I have experienced the frustrations of awkward authority and diffuse communications. We are grateful for every children's librarian who not only paid dues to PLA but took part in conference discussions and accepted committee responsibilities. It was essential that children's librarians be represented in the various groups in the recent discussions of Task Force Goals and Guidelines. It is in this forum that ideas will continue to be developed, decisions on policies that will affect children's work will be debated, and administrative opinion influenced.

Perhaps the most visible sign of changing styles in our work is in the relationships associated with administration of public libraries, and signified often by changing language. We had passed through the three stages of internal organization long ago - work with children, the children's room, and the children's department; in recent years we have added the large public library and the system or other regional entity. But these also signify classifications related to the forms of organizations by size of population served. Patterns of organization are also affected by size of area, by location with relation to other population centers, by the age and history of the library, by the pattern of the Director's relationship to the community governing authority. Lowell Martin has said that "Whenever in the past library service has been aimed at a distinguishable reading group with more or less discrete reading interests, quality of service has materially increased. The example of children's and business facilities in the public library field are illuminating because they require and promote a clear conception on the part of the library of what is read, who reads it, and how it is used." (Lowell Martin, "Toward a Qualified Postwar Library Personnel" in Personnel Administration in Libraries. [Univ. of Chicago Press, 1946] 151).

I do not know how much interested you may be in past studies of administrative patterns; perhaps the existence of two major ones might be useful in some future research. We have two studies of the categories of supervisory positions used by the larger library systems. Mary Lucas, at one time the Supervisor of Work with Children in the Newark Public Library did her doctoral study in 1941 on the organization of children's departments in large public libraries, identifying four patterns that ranged in responsibility and in authority from the (1) advisory pattern, with authority over

the main children's room and an advisory relationship to branch collections and planning; (2) cooperative - system-wide planning responsibility but no direct control over branches; (3) supervisory - with authority assigned on a broader scale than (2) but still with no direct control over branches; (4) a control pattern in which the Supervisor carried responsibility for all aspects of children's work and the administrative control throughout the system. A later study that most of you are familiar with, that of Elizabeth Gross and published in Children's Service in Public Libraries (ALA, 1963) is interesting for two reasons. This study made in 1957 was actually part of a very large study of children's library services, designed by a PLA committee of children's librarians and administrators to look at many aspects of the services. Only this study, and one other section on personnel were ever funded, and only the Gross study was completed. She found in her examination of organizational patterns essentially the same authority locations but used hyphenated titles to denote an evolutionary trend: Coordinator-Advisory, Coordinator-Advisory but reporting to the Assistant rather than the Head Librarian, Advisory-Supervisory, Main Library Head, and Supervisory. At that date Gross could say definitely that the trend was in the direction of the Coordinator. It was also evident in her study that in addition to the factors of area and population the final allocation of responsibility for book selection seemed to be a distinguishing factor in determing the organizational pattern. It has been almost fifteen years since this study was published, and a few more since the data were gathered. We have had some changes and there have been new conditioning factors on the scene.

The pressures of rising operational costs for all governmental bodies, and the consequent increased competition for federal funds and for diminishing local revenues in urban centers have brought about new management studies and solutions. All institutions operating under public funds have come under scrutiny from both internal and external management, and from groups in the community who have special concerns that their members shall share in the benefits of public programs. De-centralization has been one of the solutions adopted by many institutions, including library systems, in an attempt to bring the authority and decision making process closer to the users. As documented by many of you, administrators have taken a new and critical look at the distribution of line and staff functions, usually with the objective of clearly allocating responsibility and improving effectiveness of communication and accountability.

Obviously, the children's department has always presented peculiar problems to an administrative scheme. The work of this department is distinguished by an activity, rather than place, but also by user. Staff members are distinguished by the special knowledge of the characteristics of their users whose needs and interests encompass all areas, and the satisfaction of which is dependent upon the anticipating, selecting, organizing and making accessible appropriate materials. We are not a simple group to fit into an administrative slot! Nevertheless there is no excuse for us to be caught wearing an old-style outfit.

Most children's librarians, even some of the youngest, have grown up under a traditional style of management where there was a specialization of function, coordinated by a "head" of each unit who had immediate line responsibility and reported to a superior officer, with clear-cut lines of authority from the top, flowing downward. Each person, ideally reported to one supervisor and the "buck" wound up at the top. Probably the majority of librarians still work most comfortably with this basic pattern, but it is also probable that few are not affected to a greater or lesser degree by the concept of systems management and/or by the processes of participatory management. At the same time most children's librarians have had little time in their professional preparation to study the management process, and few have had opportunities for special

training in the skills involved in the role of administrator. It is into this setting that the pressures of change in planning and budgeting, re-ordering of priorities, and shifting of authority patterns and titles, often necessary to accommodate new activities,all seem to be most disturbing. What new styles must we assume?

Obviously one is a new language. But to some extent it is a new perception of our status - not only the children's librarian as educator, but as manager. It is another of the roles that the children's librarian has always filled as soon as even a part-time assistant has been added to the staff. The responsibility for planning, evaluating, accounting and reporting is a very familiar one. The present interpretation of that role, however, seems to be most effectively that of a partner in the management team of the library, as a different concept from the familiar line or staff position. We are being advised to think and communicate like an administrator. To me this means studying management styles in order to better analyze and assess new and projected situations, in order to understand the motivations, interests and creativity of co-workers in contributing to the achievement of objectives. Perhaps most importantly to me it means practicing something we preach, the discipline of formulating and stating goals - long range improvements that should undergird all activity planning; and, with the same specificity, identifying the realizable objectives to contribute to those goals in a reasonable time, all constraints of cost, timing, and priorities having been weighed.

To illustrate - a long-established goal is to serve the child as an individual. This is one of the valuable conditions of the climate of a good public library for children, but in stating this goal we need to identify some ways of achieving and measuring progress toward it, e.g. improving our facilities to make physical contact with the individual child easier; analyzing our audience presently served - where do they come from, how do they come, what do they do when they come, etc.; planning for discussion groups that encourage free expression by users; and the host of other ideas not vaguely thrown off the wheel as I am doing, but each examined for cost, staff time, facilities, relationship to other community programs. Priorities can then be established.

But the best laid plans of the best manager will not be realized without effective communications. This is an umbrella term covering so many of our daily responsibilities, frustrations, activities, but in the management area it is an almost certain basis for success or failure. I have long suspected that children's librarians have given less attention than was wise to those communication lines that are links to other levels of the library organization. We can remind ourselves of the obvious essentials: (1) regular reporting - in written but brief form, whether asked for by the administrator of the library or not - and with the content directed toward the objectives currently receiving priority by the total library program; (2) recommendations and suggestions, presented in similar manner, written and in the context of library and/or community interests and concerns, and always including the evidence that the relationship of a suggested activity or program has been examined for its effect on the total library program. A positive attitude to suggestions presented by an administrator or a co-worker has, perhaps added, and its absence detracted, more from the image of the children's librarian as a member of a "team" than any other aspect of our personal and inter-staff relationships. We have reason to feel discouraged and frequently mis-understood because other library staff do not seem to reasonably comprehend what the demands of a live and growing children's service encompasses. But as part of a team, we have a responsibility to accept for examination every serious recommendation. Only in this way can we earn, and then assume participation in the planning, the modification or rejection of proposed changes, with alternatives if necessary to achieve the same

objectives. To extend this role, the anticipation of apparent needs for changes to improve service, and the development of solutions should be a large segment of the children's librarian's continuing communications, and should give constant evidence of the role being performed by that individual and staff.

The shifting of Children's Coordinators from the management team often happens, as you have recognized, as a result of management surveys, and also, as noted in your investigations, can be regarded as a failure on the part of the survey team and/or administrator to recognize the dimensions of the coordinator's responsibilities, to see only the iceberg-tip of the total service. Such lack of perception is actually a failure to take into account the complexities of a position which has evolved inevitably to be a combination of both staff and line aspects. It should be pointed out that if the expertise and specialized knowledge of the Children's Coordinator is missing from the management team under any organization pattern it will signal for all observers the failure to regard seriously a large segment of the population served by the public library. The failure of the Children's Coordinator to survive a management change may, on the other hand, be due to past failures on the part of that representative to identify himself or herself as part of the management team. There is no question but that the tasks that bring to us and to our users the greatest satisfactions are service functions; they are easily recognizable, and often newsworthy, and are chiefly the reasons we are committed to children's librarianship; but their success and the success of a very considerable segment of the total library program is also due to the planning, organization and administration of staff, budget, facilities, and the maintenance of a wide-reaching and very visible pattern of community relationships by Coordinator and staff of children's specialists.

That there are failures on the part of administrators to interpret the character of the children's service may, however, be due to failures to communicate in the language of management - as simple as it sounds. For example, the past claims to the uniqueness of the children's program have seldom been supported by definitions and evidence of our claims to that characteristic.

We may have failed to revise and bring up-to-date our methods of presenting budget and staff needs in terms that the local authority and the administrator are using. In today's organizations this process usually means anticipatory pre-planning, analysis of proposed programs in terms of needs, with specific plans for implementation of stated goals supported by hard figures on cost, time involved and recognition of possible impact on the overall library system's program, with suggestions for measuring effectiveness.

At the level of more informal communications, children's librarians may have turned a deaf ear too many times to suggestions for program change. The reasons may have been many and justified, but it may be that we have been too often taking it for granted that there is a lack of interest and understanding on the part of other department heads and administrators; often, I think, we have failed to ask for advice, or invited participation from these same officers. I testify from experience that a continuous program of in-service education of our co-workers is necessary so that they know what we are about. A dramatic example is the usefulness of sharing the evidence of language learning experience, and the social and personal growth in communication skills that we see in the storytelling programs, as well as the obvious joy of sharing literary pleasures.

To repeat an earlier comment for emphasis here, at our professional organization level we have failed to make our collective voices heard as public librarians, first of all. Children's librarians have not yet, except for a few notable examples of whom

we are proud, built up the membership and active participation in PLA to insure continuous recognition of the role of children's work in every area of planning.

I am never happy to repeat words like failure but in this case I have recognized that it is possible that some of the misunderstandings, wrong interpretations, and reservations concerning the vitality and future of children's services in the Public Library that have surfaced in recent years have had their sources in long-entrenched fallacious thinking, and have been magnified into trends. For example: it is a fact that good school libraries where they exist are serving most of the day-to-day, on-the-spot needs of children, and they should be strengthened to provide the total media service that a quality educational experience needs. Children's librarians also recognize that a good educational climate in the community means serving the library-related needs of children every place that they are. This includes, and will include the public library as long as our present institutional forms of community services exist. Many of the old stereotypes of the school library are disappearing; the modern school media center is a different environment for study and personal quests than many of us experienced. Whatever the degree of change, however, it is not conceivable from our present knowledge that there will be a time when the communication needs of all children will be completely satisfied without access to all libraries, including the public library. There will always be children seeking knowledge and information only available in the general collections, through network facilities, stored in data banks, and in the special indexes available at the various neighborhood libraries. These children, as well as the adults who work with them, should find a specialist in children's services to help them. Librarians are finding exciting ways to participate in a variety of other networks. Why are we neglecting to do the same in our own communities to provide rich experiences for children with media (and do not ever think that I mean only non-print media) in every possible scene? Why are we so afraid of duplication? It should be one of our strengths. Why are we so afraid of experimenting with new forms of schedule, sharing of resources, talents and services?

Another stereotype - Is there really an erosion of children's services? There is a tendency for new attempts at organization to be reported as the coming situations. Is the mere shift of management titles a loss in policy-making leverage and communications power? If so, this is of great seriousness. If they are not of this magnitude, operationally, are we being diverted from the development of our programs to defend old fortresses? I was cheered by news from Mary Jane Anderson at ALA Headquarters that there is an increase in the number of children's librarians, country-wide; not in the large libraries where there is a decrease in urban systems, but in the medium-sized libraries. The loss of children's librarians at the large library level, however, is serious in its implications, for possible erosion of service in areas where the survival of communities is being threatened as we suspect, and the loss of leadership at this level will remove a strength for the medium-size and small library. It is impossible to conceive of the effective growth of network services without the guidance of experienced Children's Coordinators.

I want to speak briefly about the present problems that I see in library education. In keeping with current professional preparation theories, most of the accredited library schools today are offering courses in management. The content may be presented as a general course(s) in organization, administration and management, similar to the earlier courses in Administration of Libraries or even Public Administration; or the content may be presented as part of the courses in types of libraries, e.g. Administration of Public Libraries as part of a general course in public libraries. In whatever way each school has chosen to organize this course content, it seems to me that everyone that expects to work in public libraries should include that area of study in his or her program. In addition is the necessity to have course content in children's

library services and programs to extend the principles of management into the specialized field, such a course should be in addition to the essential courses in media selection and utilization. Consideration of programs and services should include emphasis on the characteristics of the child audience and their library-related needs, informational services for children, development of techniques for introducing and using materials with children, work with exceptional children, among other units. We have known for a long time that much could be achieved by more flexible organization of "courses", we know also that the time is long past for better use of cross-disciplinary study - notably with departments of education, urban sociology, and behavioral sciences. The important point is that the course content of specialized services cannot effectively and adequately be combined in the Public Library course, nor can it absorb the introduction to a sound basis in management techniques. This is not to say that there is only one way to organize these learning experiences. It is to say that a tendency you have deplored toward generalization and away from an essential specialization is being accelerated if the professional preparation of new librarians does not provide for (1) study of the public library as an institution in a social and political setting, and in which children are part of the users, (2) a study of the specialized needs of children, needs that are library-related, and (3) the providing and organizing of resources and methods for responding to those needs.

As the available time in pre-professional preparation becomes shorter and the chart of learning experiences recognized as useful becomes longer, it becomes increasingly obvious that in-service and continuing education will be essential. A number of solutions are suggested and possible, but let us recognize here that children's librarians, experienced and new, should indicate their interest in long-range curricular programs for career development by making their collective and individual voices heard in testimony, resolutions, and suggestions, however, to library school Deans, and should seek roles on library school advisory boards by being active alumni and community representatives.

A second area of influence is one that many of you have provided with valuable service, that of teaching in professional programs. Desperately needed are experienced children's librarians with the academic credentials to fill positions on library school faculties. Programs sometimes go by default because they lack faculty strength in their fields. The need is not only for the teacher but also the researcher to interpret our present status and to chart future directions.

If there is one important thing to be said today, from my perch here, it is that the key to changing the role of the children's librarian is to be expressed in the active, not passive voice. It is not defending the old but anticipating and designing the new.

I feel certain that much of our time in professional conferences, workshops, staff meetings should be spent, not in sorting out what we are or in proving past practice as best, but in identifying <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> our voices should be heard to change what we fear as obstructing our ability to apply our knowledge and talents to the fullest extent and by vigorously examining all possible clues for what the future will bring in opportunities for fulfilling the tradition inherited from those early pioneer "attendants" - It is a challenge for you to seize the opportunity to design the patterns of preparation, and the community services of libraries to the children of the 21st century. I think the time to be about it is 10:00, June 16, 1977, The nightingale's fate is in good hands, I wish you all success.

"Take This Coal and Go Make a Hell of Your Own" -- Children's Services and Library Administrators

F. William Summers
College of Librarianship
University of South Carolina

President's Preconference
June 16, 1977

It is obvious from the title and background of this conference that there is among children's librarians a belief that what has been regarded as one of the glories of the American public library may now be a bit tarnished, and that rather than being a jewel in the crown of the local public library the Children's Service may now be seen as a piece of costume jewelry which has grown a bit tawdry and shopworn over the years. It will be the purpose of this paper to examine whether or not this change in status has indeed occured, and if so, to suggest from an administrative point of view why this may be the case and to offer some suggestions of what might be done to remedy the situation. Before doing so, two caveats are probably in order. First, I do not know very many library administrators who would be entirely comfortable in having their concerns and viewpoints represented by a library school dean. There is a widespread belief among practitioners, especially administrators, that as soon as a person enters the door of a library school they lose all knowledge of and concern about the practical aspects of the profession and become ivory-towered theorists. This is not the occasion to argue that point of view but to suggest these feelings are not evident in a number of other professions, notably medicine and law, and wonder why we are different. I did want to alert you to the fact that if you go back home and tell your administrator that Bill Summers said administrators ought to do such and such the response may well be "so what".

The other caveat which should be asserted is to remind you that I am very much in sympathy with your position. There may be some things in this paper with which you will disagree, perhaps strongly, but I hope that you will take them as suggestions of a person who shares your concerns.

Phil Ennis once referred to what he called, "The library faith", the unanalyzed belief that reading makes you better and that reading better books makes you even better. It seems to me that the children's services of public libraries have been both blessed and cursed by a substantial oversubscription to the library faith. We all believe, some of us fervently, that children reading books, attending story hours and taking part in programs is a very good thing. We are unable to be very specific about why it is a very good thing or what the outcomes are or should be. To be sure that this was not an isolated and perhaps incorrect impression, I sought evidence from the literature. Peggy Sullivan has commented, "It may be that good children's or elementary school librarians are so engrossed in their real work that they have neither the inclination nor the competence to chronicle or analyze their efforts."[1] Pauline Winnick has commented that children's services along with other types of library services suffer "From the lag to define objectives, provide current statistics and standards that can be used to measure performance levels, and answer to the community in terms of the social value of their services."[2]

Such inadequacies seem strange when one considers that children's services have been a well defined and long established element in library services, and that certainly many of the outstanding leaders of the profession have been people associated

with library service to children. Why then is the children's service of public libraries largely undocumented and unmeasured? Why are we unable to face administrators who are dealing with financial stringency, with hard facts which state--this service is essential, it should not be cut, or must be cut last and least.

If the literature of children's library service is examined in the light of Sullivan's statement a possible answer may be found. First, the bulk of literature about children's services does not deal with children but with materials for children. There has been a great tendency to focus upon materials, to evaluate them, to discuss their usefulness, to influence their creation, and to preserve standards of excellence. All of this is commendable and is certainly one of your major accomplishments as a professional group, but it probably does not do a great deal to strengthen your position within the local library.

Second, the literature about children's service programs is largely descriptive, and not evaluative. Much of it falls into what Ralph Shaw once called the "How I run my library good" vein. I examined three recent, and I am sure very good and useful, books about children's services: Start Early for an Early Start,[3] The Special Child in the Library,[4] and Library Programs Worth Knowing About.[5] Each of these books was published within the last year. In each case there were excellent descriptions of the programs, ample and high quality lists of materials, and clear and full descriptions of each program. Had I been a children's librarian looking to develop a new program, these books would have been gold mines but as an administrator they left a lot to be desired. In none of them was there a description of what was expected to happen as a result of the program. In none of them is there any suggestion of costs of the programs, nor of the anticipated volumes of activity, nor is there discussion of whether this program might be more important or worthwhile than other programs which the library is utilizing. Despite these deficiencies almost every article concluded with the description that the program had been highly successful and was worthy of emulation by other libraries.

Thirdly, and I think most importantly, children's services in public libraries have been seen as an art rather than a science. The great heroines and heroes are people who are viewed as role models for young librarians. Traditionally, one learned children's librarianship by working under the direction of one of the great children's librarians, not from formal study or the mastery of a set of principles and theories derived from research. This cycle of apprentice to master has been repeated over and over in library system after library system. There is no intention to deprecate this pattern but it does have an associated cost and it does contribute to your present situation. Throughout history it has been clear that when science is in the forefront art suffers and when rationality is a primary criterion then the emotional suffers. Focusing upon the artistic and the emotional aspects of your work has certainly contributed to your programatic success, but it has left you very ill-prepared to deal with the demands of the scientific-rational approach to decision making which is very much evident in libraries today.

Clearly standing out as leaders in children's work have been the coordinators and supervisors of children's services in the major public library systems of the country. It is evident from your concerns and earlier discussion that the significance of the positions has declined and in many cases been eliminated. As one who has observed these positions from several viewpoints, over a number of years, it is not surprising that this has occured. The position of children's coordinator has in most public libraries been much more of a supervisory or administrative position than a coordinating one. The anecdotal materials in your review of issues reveals concerns about the loss of administrative clout to a much greater extent than the loss of the

staff functions which may be involved. The problem of whether these positions were line or staff in the traditional meanings of those terms has never really been resolved. In times of affluence and growth most organizations can tolerate such structural ambiguities without stress but in times of retrenchment they become serious problems. It can be anticipated that without clarifying actions the position of coordinator or supervisor will continue to erode. As issues like community control and accountability intensify, libraries will seek a tighter chain of command with more direct relationships between central administration and service functions. There will also be a continued effort to reduce administration staff in favor of operating staff. We have never really found a way to resolve the problems of relationships between branch librarians and their administrative hierarchy and the children's librarians and their administrative hierarchy. Where these relationships have been successful they have depended much more upon the personalities involved than upon a clear delineation of the responsibilities and functions of each.

It is also clear that the positions of supervisor or coorcinator have been characterized by relatively long tenure of a single individual. Where this is the case the personality of the individual and their particular set of strengths and weaknesses has tended to be built into the system to a very great extent. Despite its many fine accomplishments, the children's service in public libraries has tended to be relatively isolated. Again, to quote Sullivan, "Perhaps because many librarians in public library children's rooms and in elementary schools have spent so much of their time working in isolation they have had the opportunity to be decidely individual in their program."[6] This isolation and individuality, while it may be very valuable from a programmatic point of view, does not lend itself to communication with others who do not hold the same set of essential values. It is also a qualitative factor which does not easily permit quantitative measurement.

Discussions with children's librarians can easily lead the skeptic and the hostile to the belief that this group of librarians sees themselves as possessed of a particular set of orthodoxies which cannot be understood or appreciated by others, that only they are concerned about the intellectual growth and development of children and that only they will uphold the eternal and largely unarticulated verities which underlies their work. If this be the case there are tough days ahead. It is well and perhaps good to decry the emphasis of quantity over quality. It is essential, however, that if this is to be done that quality must be defined in terms other than its own assertion. It is not enough to say that we have a quality program without being able to state what that quality is. Certainly, a quality program is more than a collection of good books. It is almost axiomatic that wherever quality cannot be defined and identified that quantity will be accepted in its place.

Similarly, if you are concerned that generalists are being preferred over specialists in library positions, you need to be asking yourself what is so special about them. What is the array of skills, attitudes and values which these people need that is not possessed by other librarians. While I do not always agree with our colleagues in the school media field, it is patently obvious that they have indeed gone a long way toward identifying what is so special about the media specialist and have done some rather substantial research on the impact which the properly trained specialist can have on a program. In fact, they appear to be very near to being able to identify the costs, in terms of student learning and growth, which the absence of a media specialist and a media program might produce. Compare this with the assertions which we can make today about the impact of a children's specialist.

While on the subject of school media programs it needs to be said that the consequences of dramatically improved school media programs upon public library

children's services has yet to be adequately measured or articulated. It is not intended to raise the issue of duplication nor the age old dilemma of role articulation. Rather, to say that school media services and public library services both deal with the same child and both are concerned about the intellectual and information development of that child and that a dramatic increase in one level is bound to have an impact upon the program of the other. Thus far, there have been all too few efforts to define, measure and assess that impact.

Obviously you are not concerned solely with identifying and explaining the problems besetting children's services but you also want to consider steps which might alleviate or eliminate the problem. In order to consider some of these you will have to put yourself, at least for the moment, in an administrative mode and consider what you do from an administrator's viewpoint. You must be concerned with the rational allocation of limited or decreasing resources across competing and conflicting demands. Every unit claims to be important and to be making a maximum contribution to the total effort. Each claims that its client group is the most significant and will be the most bereft if services are cut. Recently each claims to be making a maximum contribution to the priorities of serving minorities and helping to improve the environment. In short, the administrator is faced with service units whose inevitable answer to difficult questions is we all are important, none can be cut and our users are the most needy. In the face of such irrationality is it suprising that administrators often resort to equally irrational actions, cut all budgets 10%, reduce all hours evenly, eliminate specialists and hire people who can do a variety of jobs which need to be done.

From time immemorial when faced with adversity people tend to retreat to their point of greatest strength--this is almost animal instinct. In medieval times armies defeated in the field retreated to the castle. Those defeated in the provinces retreated to the capitol. So it is in public libraries that we see a general retreat to the central library which is viewed as the position of greatest strength. I happen to believe that this is erroneous and that the great central libraries of America are millstones around our necks and that the effort to preserve a large retrospective collection will inevitably drag us down to defeat. Nevertheless it is true that all over the nation we are seeing a gigantic retreat to the central library. Branches are being closed, hours decreased, staffs cut, both in terms of quality and quantity, and a greater and greater proportion of the materials budget is being spent to maintain the central library.

How do we counteract this. Here are a few suggestions:

1. Do not spend a lot of effort feeling sorry for yourself or bemoaning the fact that you are unappreciated or misunderstood. When the fat is in the fire it is much more important to snatch it out than to argue about who is at fault for its being there. You cannot all be the victims of misinformed administrators with misplaced values. Remember that it is never someone else's fault that they don't understand your problems and your programs. If your message in unheard then perhaps it is not phrased in terms which are germane to the current situation or it is not presented at a time or by a method which is appropriate.

2. You must begin immediately the process of developing measures for the outcome of your services. At first, you may be limited to the collection of purely anecdotal data about people or groups who benefit from service programs. Even anecdotal data can have significant impact if it is systematically collected. For example, we have been convincing Congress for years that LSCA really does things for disadvantaged

people largely through the use of anecdotal data. You can't stay there forever however. You have to move on to some much more structured and carefully designed measures of the outcomes of your activities. You need a great many more studies like Margaret Fife's study of reading gain or loss from participation in a summer reading program.[7] You need to begin looking at the relationships between use of children's services and various measures of success in school or indeed in life. Ted Hines now chairman of the library science program at UNC, Greensboro, once suggested that the real measure of the success of children's services ought to be the number of adult readers produced. This is obviously a difficult question to explore but the results might well be worth the efforts. You might want to try to work with a few library schools in this regard. Some of them at least have people who know a bit about the problems of designing inquiry and can certainly put you in touch with other people on their campuses who know a good bit more. If you want to join the long line of people complaining about the failures of library schools that avenue is certainly open to you, but it might be much more fruitful to enlist their cooperation in solving some of your problems than in berating them for their failures.

3. Put some pressure on your state library agency to do something significant about its own programming in the area of children's services. The most recent issue of the ASLA President's newsletter lists state level personnel responsible for youth services and it is a sorry record. There are only 18 states in which there is a person whose position title clearly indicates a primary responsibility for youth services. There are three other states in which the position is apparently vacant. In the remaining 29 states either general consultants who presumably have an array of other responsibilities do something about children's services or nothing is done from the state level.[8] It is quite probable that no single step could do more to enervate children's services in a state than for the state library to give some priority to this area in its own programming.

4. Take a very critical look at the position of children's coordinator on the local level and make a realistic determination, not blinded by the past, of what is needed. If it really is an administrative position, then address the serious questions of how it articulates with the remainder of the administrative organization. If you decide that is what is needed is a coordinating function, give some thought to an organization form which will be appropriate. You might be much better off with a collegial form, in which the coordinator is selected from among the group of children's librarians and functions for a fixed term of three years or so, than with a quasi-administrative position which assumes continuity of the same individual over a long period of time.

5. Look very carefully at the interfaces of children's services in public libraries and in schools. The schools are faced with some of the same kinds of demands for accountability as the public library and it is possible that you might jointly find measures of performance which show both agencies to be performing at a high level of success. You are not likely to get to these questions if you spend a lot of time complaining about not being informed about assignments.

6. Be assertive about the quantitative measures of library service. Certainly most children's departments perform very well on a unit cost basis. They tend to have rather high utilization and relatively low costs. You may need to measure the high volume operations such as circulation in order to justify the low volume, qualitative functions like story hours, which tend to have a relatively higher unit cost. If you leave the cost calculations to other you will always lose. Sure it costs more to tell a story than to show a film or play a record. Don't apologize for that but be prepared to indicate why the high cost is worthwhile.

7. Be as specific and realistic as you can about what you need and what you expect from library schools. Bear in mind that the one year professional education program does not provide much time for mastery of basics as well as the development of a specialization. On the other hand, most students do concentrate on some service or functional specialty and there is no reason why a program of specialization in children's services cannot be as well developed as one in any other area.

If you really are convinced that this speciality has unique characteristics it may be worthwhile to identify these and seek to create some extra-educational recognition such as a national board to certify practitioners in the field. The Medical Library Association, for example, is going in this direction and other groups ranging from bar associations to secretary's groups have done so for a long time.

In conclusion, it seems that you have taken an important step in recognizing and beginning to define the problem. You may need to more carefully articulate the issues in terms of the whole set of problems affecting public libraries. Thus far your focus has been upon your own area but before enlarging the area of discussion it is important to decide on the outcomes you can reasonably expect. Returning to the good old days is probably not possible. You can only go forward from here and you need a clear picture of what you want the future to be and why, in terms of the children you serve, it must be that way.

NOTES

1. Sullivan, Peggy. "Library Service to Children: Celebration and Survival", Horn Book 52:253, June 1976.

2. Winnick, Pauline. "Evaluation of Public Library Services to Children", Library Trends 22:361-376, January 1974.

3. Johnson, Ferne, Ed. Start Early For an Early Start. Chicago, A.L.A., 1976.

4. Baskin, Barbara H. and Harris, Karen J. Eds. The Special Child in the Library. Chicago, A.L.A., 1976.

5. U. S. Office of Education. Library Programs Worth Knowing About. Washington, D.C., U.S.E.A., 1976.

6. Sullivan, Op. Cit., P. 262.

7. Fife, Margaret E. Effects of the Vacation Reading Program of Selected Third Grade Children. Atlanta, Ga., Division of Librarianship, Emory University, 1963.

8. American Library Association. Association of State Library Agencies. "State Library Consultants for Youth Services", ASLA President's Newsletter 7:44-481, May 1977.

Mary Kingsbury
The University of North Carolina

Paper for President's Preconference
June 16, 1977

The goal of today's conference, in one of the sheets that came out, is to identify trends in management's organization in planning that weaken library services to children. The purpose of the study I'm reporting on, a study carried out two years ago, was to identify trends, goals, and innovations in children's services in public libraries considered likely to evolve or considered desirable to be implemented as we move through the last quarter of the 20th century. Today, I'm reporting only on some of the trends. Two assumptions underlie this study. One, the assumption that more success follows from trying to plan for the future than from giving up all attempts to plan, and two, the assumption that trends can be affected by the choices and decisions made by those concerned with children's services. Daniel Bell, the noted social scientist in his recent venture in social forecasting states that, and I quote, "At crucial points trends become subject to choice and the decision to accelerate or deflect trends is a policy intervention which may create a turning point in the history of an institution."

This last quarter of the 20th century may well be such a turning point for the future of children's services in public libraries. Although this study does not focus on management's approach to such services, knowing what trends leaders of the profession foresaw two years ago may be of value to you today as you work to identify priorities for the future. A modification of the Delphi technique developed by Olaf Helmer and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation was used to gather data. I'm not going to say anything more about that. In the spring of 1975, the coordinators of children's services in the 50 largest cities in the United States were each asked to suggest one or two trends, desirable or undesirable, likely to be present in children's services in public libraries over the next 25 years, and also to provide the name of a well qualified children's librarian. Sixty-two percent (31) responded to this initial request in time to be included in a second phase. Their suggested trends, reduced to 17 statements, were then sent back to all 50 cities - to the coordinators, plus the 31 recommended librarians. Sixty-two percent of this total group returned it in time to be included in the results reported here. In light of the fact that at the time of the study some of the 50 largest cities did not have a coordinator in a coordinator's position (the position was open), the response rate was really quite good.

Respondents agree in their rankings of the first three trends. They differ however in their estimate of the desirability of a particular trend. In the case of the third ranked trend which called for the renovation of existing physical facilities so that they are more inviting to the children, 40% of the coordinators gave that a top priority rating of 1 on the 5 point scale. But, only 25% of the librarians gave it a top priority rating of one.

The first ranked trend and the 10th called for increased cooperation with other agencies that served the child. [First ranked]: work with groups of children in day care centers, school classes, etc. The tenth ranked trend: children's services staff will spend more of their time outside library walls in out-reach programs than inside. Both of these will take children's librarians out of the library and into the community. It is difficult to reconcile the difference in priority ratings assigned these two trends. If you're going to be working outside, it seems that you are going to have to be spending time outside. However, they gave a very high priority rating to cooperation and not such a high priority rating to the other. If children's librarians are to develop the cooperative efforts called for in the first trend, they will have to spend

much more time away from the library. Perhaps the emphasis on spending more time outside the library than inside caused respondents to assign priority ratings that are at such variance with those assigned the first trend. For example, the total group together (70%) gave the first ranked trend a high priority rating. Only 14% gave #10 a high priority rating of one. Sixty percent fewer coordinators, for example, consider having librarians spending time outside the library as highly desirable as they consider increased cooperation with other agencies, and yet it does seem inevitable that if more cooperation is to take place, librarians will be working outside the library a good part of the time.

Several of the trends deal with materials. The fourth trend, for example, predicts greater emphasis on paperbacks. Necessity it seems may make bedfellows or at least library fellows of paperbacks and of all the children's librarians who for years have refused to give their hearts and their money to any books but those in library bindings. This does seem a case of having paperbacks thrust upon us, of being forced to accept them on economic grounds rather than from higher motives. It may be, however, that all things will work together onto good at least for the children, for surely only the most obdurate of us can refuse to recognize the wealth of reading materials in children's paperbacks. And it may be that those of us who aren't working on the library floor don't have a realistic estimate of the need for durable goods. In any case, respondents to this study actually using materials with children, the practicing librarians, find this a less desirable trend than do the coordinators. Only 30% of the librarians give it a high priority rating compared to 40% of the coordinators.

Practicing librarians on the other hand are slightly more in favor of increased use in programming and circulation of non-book material such as toys, records, video cassettes and other electronic devices. This trend ranked 8th on all the lists. The 9th ranked trend forecasts that the emphasis in children's services will be directed toward meeting the recreational needs of children rather than their curricular needs, and suggests as a corollary that the materials to be purchased will be meeting recreational rather than curricular needs. By extension this trend sets up lines of demarcation between the needs met by school library media centers and public libraries. Rather than duplicating materials and services, the efforts of each would be directed at meeting different needs of children.

The last trend that deals with materials may well be the most controversial. Ranked 14th by all respondents combined, it predicts less emphasis on children's literature that librarians think children ought to have. Again, compared with the coordinators, a greater percentage of the practicing librarians give this a top priority rating. Assuming that by children's literature is meant quality literature, and I think that is a reasonable assumption, this may well be the most controversial of all the trends evaluated in this study. Controversial if not to all at least to those whose spirits respond to the words of Frances Clark Sayers in her William Warner Bishop Lecture at the University of Michigan. After challenging librarians to become the belligerent profession she urged us to, and I quote, "Declare before everyone that the purpose of the public library is to foster, promote and initiate the reading of books which not only serve the community but stretch the minds and imaginations of its constituents to such peaks of their ability as they never dreamed of. Somewhere, somehow there has got to be an institution which belligerently attacks the mediocre, the slick, the sentimental, the commercial that is typical of the mass culture of our day." That is no voice from the ivory tower of Academia. In 1949 when she gave the William Warner Bishop lecture at Michigan, Frances Clark Sayers was the head of children's services at New York Public. She knew that the good books, books of excellence, often need more promoting than the mediocre ones. After expressing her concern that her own

library had recommended Cry the Beloved Country for moderate purchase while at the same time books of lesser stature were recommended for extensive purchase, she went on to say, "why don't we assail people with books. We should be noisy about books in a noisy world." The world is certainly noisier today than it was in 1949 but that still does not excuse those committed to bringing children and books together from the responsibility of working to assure that those are the best books.

Leaving that particular bone of contention let's speculate for a moment about the impact that will result when the 5th and 6th ranked trends become common practice. I use the word "when" rather than "if" advisedly because it seems to me that the realization of many of these trends require little more than the determination of those responsible for children's services, and in many cities these trends are already common practice. Be that as it may, the 5th ranked trend calls for greater emphasis on services to pre-school children, their parents and instructors. It should be pointed out that the coordinators and practicing librarians differ more in their estimate of the desirability of this trend than they do in their estimates of any other. Forty-seven percent of the coordinators give it a top priority rating compared with only 30% of the librarians. Frankly the coordinators appear to be showing more vision than their colleagues. Pre-schoolers represent a population not served by the library media centers in the schools. Provision of service to that group is an additional justification for keeping children's services in the public libraries. The 6th ranked trend will, like the 5th, bring more adults into the children's room. It predicts that children's librarians will become engaged in adult education, advising and training parents in the evaluation of materials and programs. This trend can do a great deal to make the public aware of the unique contribution made by the specialists in children's materials and services. And, it will take specialists to provide the services outlined in these trends. It is almost ludicrous to think of a so-called generalist making the attempt. By working to hasten the realization of such trends, children's librarians can build up a vocal and supportive public. Children may be supportive but unfortunately they aren't given to writing letters and storming the doors of the library when the job of the children's specialist is being eliminated.

The trend that ranks last deserves comment. One reason this study was undertaken in the first place was curiosity. In the spring of '74 I did a similar study on school library media centers. Respondents to that study thought that moving all children's services into the schools was highly desirable. I think it ranked third of all the list of desirable things to have. I wanted to find out what children's librarians in public libraries thought about such a move. The answer is here in the last trend. Respondents to this study, as one might have suspected, definitely do not want the schools to take over all children's services. No one gave that a top priority rating. But not wanting it to happen won't prevent it from happening, and that brings us to the last trend to be discussed, the one that ranks 7th. Though it is directed at the need for developing methods for measuring the effectiveness of children's services it points up a problem that has plagued the profession for years. We haven't (and not just the children's services people, it plagues the entire profession) had many good studies on effectiveness of library services. How do we determine the effectiveness of library services? We have talked it seems for ever about the problem of measuring services but few have attempted to solve it. If economic restrictions continue we may be forced to do more than talk. Certainly the threat of having children's services removed to school libraries or drastically reduced in public libraries has impressed upon respondents to this study the need to justify keeping those services in the public library.

These then are some of the trends that experts foresaw two years ago. Some are certainly more desirable than others. Having identified them we can now plan with management to bring about the organizational changes necessary to accelerate those that are most desirable and to deflect those that are least desirable. Thus making this pre-conference a turning point in strengthening library services to children.

Travels with Three Questionnaires

Mae Benne
University of Washington, Seattle

President's Preconference
June 16, 1977

If I were a prudent person, I would not be at this lectern. Although all of the interviews for the study have been completed--the last two this month--I have not been able to begin writing the final report. Alas for you, this will not be a digest of my findings, but rather some preliminary observations on a few--I hope--appropriate topics and a few opinions which could change when the data have been considered in more depth. Whatever balance this paper may have had at the beginning has disappeared in my somewhat futile attempt to reduce it to twenty minutes. Most of the happier comments had to be deleted.

The objective of my study was to identify the changing role or function of the Central Children's Library in 27 urban library systems in the United States--and two in Canada. I was particularly interested in how its function might have been affected by changes in the central city, and in administrative patterns, and by priorities set in response to financial problems besetting large urban centers.

I am especially indebted to the Council on Library Resources who were kind enough to grant me one of the 1976-77 fellowships and to the University of Washington who accepted my application for a year's professional leave. I owe a large debt to the staffs of the libraries included in the study for their cooperation, interest, and generous hospitality. I hope the final report--when it is written--will prove to be useful.

Where these positions existed, I interviewed three people: the central children's librarian; the children's coordinator for the system or the children's specialist for the branch department; and the chief of the central building whether or not he/she was the line officer for the central children's library. In two systems, I also interviewed the chief of branch services who serves as line officer for the central children's library. To save time, I will refer to these three groups as the Concerned Three.

First a few general observations. Changes within the family have had their effect on how and when children use libraries. Children of working parents are dependent on their caretakers, be they individuals or institutions, to bring them to the library during the day. Children in the central library during the week day are likely to be there as part of a group--day care, nursery school, elementary school class--while family use is high on weekends. In those libraries that are able to offer Sunday afternoon hours, several report that more than half of the circulation in the children's library occurs on the weekends.

The central children's collections are usually restricted to children's materials, contemporary and historical, specialized indexes and bibliographies to facilitate use, and depending upon library policy, adult materials on children's literature and reading. Materials about the child--education, care, social problems--are in several of the other subject departments.

Over half of the libraries keeping separate juvenile circulation statistics reported a loss in juvenile circulation over the past six years at the central library. Losses were attributed to reduced hours, staff, materials budgets and programming; various

problems in the central city environment, and improved branch facilities. All of the libraries maintaining reference statistics, except one, reported rather healthy increases.

Slightly over half of the systems report that the number of professional positions for children's librarians has decreased. In a few libraries, the qualifications of persons filling children's positions have also changed. In one library with over 30 children's positions, 2/3 lack the MLS.

The majority of central children's libraries have experienced somewhat fewer cuts than children's extension services. This has carried with it added responsibilities for system services and/or assistance in the central library.

The majority of children's librarians appeared to believe that children's services have not suffered disproportionally during this period. However, two librarians could not report because of a change in the method of apportioning the budget. A few, in fact, believed that children's services may have fared somewhat better than other departments. With one exception, no children's coordinator reported that the percentage of the materials budget allocated for children's materials had decreased noticeably; in a few instances, there had been increases.

ISOLATION

Twenty years ago, I heard Max Lerner give a one word definition of America. It was "Access." I was never convinced that this was the right word--then and now. The word that keeps re-occurring when I think of the Central children's library is "Isolation." Isolation occurs, of course, because of attitudes, habits, organizational structure, policies, architecture, imperfect communication, and a host of other reasons.

The main card catalog in over half of the libraries does not provide subject access to children's materials. Of the number who do, four have only recently begun this practice. One chief of a central library remarked, "It is the adult librarian who suffers with this omission."

Some children's libraries are physically isolated from or within the central library. While we all know the intent behind the architecture, the result has been to increase the isolation of materials and staff. During budget cuts, it is a likely area to close because it often requires extra guards or attendants. One children's library is so isolated from the rest of the building that some children believe they need two library cards to use all the departments. Some adults may not be aware that there is a children's library. It takes the efforts of all staff to overcome what some architects have wrought.

Very few libraries have involved their children's staff in the planning and training phases of new adult programs and services, such as telephone ready reference, even though children make use of the service.

There is no exchange of staff on a regular basis between central children's and other departments in the central library, nor with one exception any exchange between the central children's staff and branch children's librarians. Barriers to staff exchanges were identified as the present staffing difficulties, administrative separateness of branches and central, the need for continuity in branch children's services, the need for specialists rather than generalists at central, and the reluctance of adult librarians to work with children. However, staffs of three central children's libraries do take their turn at adult information desks. One library crossed-trained the central staff to work in all departments which has resulted in a better utilization of resources. In another, a continuing education program for staff began in the

children's library which noticeably increased their referrals from other departments.

Children's librarians are either required or invited to attend meetings in 20 of the 28 central libraries who hold departmental meetings. In some instances, the children's coordinator represents children's services; in others both attend. In four libraries, however, no children's staff attend. In 17 of the 26 central libraries using committees to tackle specific problems, children's librarians have assumed some committee responsibilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

I was not prepared for the creativity revealed by the organizational patterns affecting the central children's library. If one assumes that organizational structure defines or recognizes the function of the departments or divisions within it, then the central children's library in 17 systems is a department of the Central Library and reports to its chief. In six systems, it is an integral part of children's services and reports to the children's coordinator; in two systems, it is part of a subject division within the central library and must be identified as having functions compatible with the Division. In two systems it must be viewed as a branch, for it reports to the Head of branches, although some of its statistics are included with those of the central library. Each of the others have yet a different pattern resulting from tradition or history.

All of the interviewees were asked to assess the degree of satisfaction they had with their present administrative pattern as it affected their efforts to further the goals of their departments.---and were asked to identify possible problem areas should conditions change. Only one pattern received a 100 per cent positive response with no envisioned problem areas. This was in the six systems where the central children's librarian reported to the children's coordinator. Please be assured that I am not suggesting that organizational structure be determined by popular vote. Other patterns also evoked positive response, but no other was unanimous. Probably the most often repeated comment from the central children's librarians in this pattern was, "I have a supervisor who understands the service." I find no fault with that reaction. However, I am distrubed by two other reactions expressed several times during the course of the study. One from several of the chiefs of central libraries who did not have line responsibility for the central children's library and were much relieved they did not have to cope with a service they knew little about; the other from several central children's librarians who were satisfied with the line supervision of the chief of the central building because he or she didn't interfere. They envisioned that problems could arise should the present incumbent be replaced by one who did interfere, without a sufficient knowledge of children's services. (Some chiefs, of course, received high marks for more positive reasons). Both of these reactions are all too human.

But I do not believe that children's services can survive the isolation that stems from these. Not only is the isolation a luxury it can no longer afford, but it has probably been detrimental to its health in all periods, except possibly the developing years of the service.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CONCERNED THREE

There were a number of questions asked of the concerned three that dealt with how each of the respondents perceived the role or function of the central children's library, or how they saw its place in the overall context of children's services. The responses to these and related questions will take considerable time to analyze and may provide a substantial part of the final report. I can say now, however, that the number of instances of common agreement and understanding does not appear to be high.

One could ask--does it matter? In some cases, perhaps not; in others, I believe it matters very much. I would like to draw for you two hypothetical situations involving two fictitious groups of Concerned Threes. I have taken comments out of context, rearranged them in a new configuration, and realigned the cast of librarians in order to dramatize the dilemma when these three people perceive differently the function of the central children's library.

Hypothetical Situation A

The central children's librarian believes their major role is to provide programs on a system-wide basis, especially the special offerings, and in addition to provide programs for a variety of ages, to encourage groups to bring children to the library for tours and programs. She sees her staff in a leadership role in the system's programming, developing materials and expertise to share with the branches.

The chief of the central building, her line officer, is impatient with what he calls the preoccupation of the children's staff with the book world while little attention is given to adults concerned with the child. He believes that this endless entertainment of children with puppets, crafts, etc., could be done better by other agencies and the expertise of the staff used to demonstrate to parents and other adults how to introduce books to children.

The children's coordinator sees the children's library as providing in-depth materials and knowledge in children's literature--the place where questions can be referred such as "May I have some examples of children's books that depict several kinds of evil?" and where all the children's books illustrated by Maxfield Parrish can be provided. She feels one of the current needs in the department is to develop further the staff's expertise in the literature.

Hypothetical Situation B (New cast of characters)

The central children's librarian sees two possible roles for the department--one of collection development to serve the future reference and research needs of the area and state; the other to develop a program to serve the needs of the community agencies who serve children with handicaps or special needs. The decision to emphasize one over the other is difficult when both are needed, but there is not staff to do both effectively and maintain the present public service hours. She has tried to increase use by adult subject departments but has been unsuccessful.

Her line officer, the chief of the central library, admits to an imperfect knowledge of children's services. She sees the children's library as being outside the central library's family with little in common with the other subject departments who all share a common interest in serving adults. She observes that there is little difference between the children's titles at a branch and those at central, although there are a few more at central. She wonders if its use might increase if it were moved to a branch library in a shopping center or to a storefront library. In the latter case, the historical collection could be added to one of the adult subject departments. The extemely active business department is crying for space.

The children's specialist in the branch department has neither line nor staff responsibility for the central children's library, but she would like to depend on it for short term loans on little used materials and back-up reference in children's literature. She is distressed that the bibliographic work on the fine historical collection has fallen behind, but she has been advised by her line officer, the chief of branches, not to interfere.

I repeat, these are fictitious situations and I hope no one leaves this room believing that this is what I discovered after nine months and several thousand miles. The point I want to emphasize is this: where there is a lack of common understanding of function, there is a potential for problems.

The ideal situation, probably impossible to achieve, let alone maintain, would be one in which the roles or functions were identified, agreed upon by all concerned and clearly understood by all staff. The department would be placed in the organizational structure on the basis of its function and philosophy, rather than the personalities of the lately departed. The last step would be the recruitment of staff to carry out the functions.

But roles and functions change as do staffs and societies, and it has not proven to be easy to place the possible functions of the central children's library in priority rank. In most systems the central children's library has two rather distinct roles: as a circulating branch library for adjacent population and/or area-users who come into the central city either regularly or occasionally, AND as a reference-research resource in children's materials for the system or region. It has been both a popular library and a subject department. This schizophrenic nature of the central children's library accounts for much of its frustration. Library policies which encourage one function may depress the other. If the children's library is measured by circulation, what does this do to the reference-research function? What kind of staff should be recruited? On the other hand, its multiple functions also account for one of its greatest strengths. Nowhere else in a region can an adult user, for example, find in one place an historical and a contemporary collection of children's literature, assisted by a staff able to interpret the use made by children.

During my more pessimistic periods, however, I wonder if the pressure from city budget offices for circulation as a concrete measure of use may not be more important in determining the function of central children's libraries than any set of goals evolved by the library.

TRENDS

During the past year, I have been asked several times to identify trends that I see. I have demurred, stuttered a lot, and changed the subject--primarily because I am not sure how many comprise a trend. Then, too, there is also the problem of determining if something is coming or going.

Let me mention a couple of situations and let you draw your own conclusions. In at least five of the libraries visited, control over selection of materials no longer rests with the children's specialist, but has been delegated to the individual librarians. It would be interesting to know the reasons prompting this change.

Eighteen systems have a children's coordinator or consultant who has responsibility for materials and services on a system-wide basis. Three systems have no children's specialists for the system nor for the branches. Eight systems have decentralized children's services by placing responsibility for branch children's materials or services--sometimes both, in a children's specialist, under line to the chief of branches.

I am not prepared to say whether this decentralization will correct some of the confusion that may have existed with the line and staff roles of the coordinator, or more to the point, whether it will allow for better service. I can only observe that there are now four people--the two children's staff and the chiefs of central and branches--who must maintain a system view "up front" to insure continued cooperation between the two children's staffs for system services. Libraries that have been able to inculcate the view that central and branch positions carry equal prestige will probably find this an easier task.

PROGRAMS

I can not leave the lectern without mentioning a few of the interesting services developing in our libraries. There is no correlation between budget and creative ideas in urban libraries. From the multitude, let me give you three.

One library reported excellent response to parents' shelves in the central children's libraries and in children's rooms in branches. In fact, the materials on child care are wearing out. Another central children's librarian gathered up books about child care from the adult departments and placed them in a bin in the children's library. She was unable to keep the bin replenished. A few librarians remarked during the interviews that some users expect to find materials on child care in the children's library and that many of their referrals to other departments were in this subject area.

In two systems, a children's literature department has risen phoenix-like from the former central children's library. One library with 6 or 7 years of experience with this service considers the change for their system to be the right one, for the service is well-received and is growing. Among the audience are classes in elementary and early childhood education and children's literature at the college and university level, advertisers, writers, agencies concerned with the child, classes in parenting and children's literature at the high school level. Children are not excluded but no programming is offered for them.

An interesting service that one library hopes to initiate soon is one that may meet more effectively the changing needs of family life. Through a Quick List Service, the children's staff hopes to reach the transient population that enters the central city each day at nine, and leaves at five, after spending the day in one of the high rise office buildings surrounding the library. Flyers will be distributed to the offices, inviting parents to call the children's library to ask that a number of books for a particular kind of child be set aside for the parent to select from during his or her lunch hour.

In closing, I would like to say that I began the year wondering how this study would affect my teaching. Library Schools are not immuned from the problems detailed here. In fact, there are some who believe that the problems began in library schools, and thrived in associations. But if we never get past the "who is the villian stage?" our option to determine what library services shall be will be further jeopardized. And the children will be the losers.

Margaret Mary Kimmel
University of Pittsburg

Paper for President's Preconference
June 16, 1977

I really believed until fairly recently that research was something that happened to someone else. That it is was the province of rats and mazes and people in white coats. I have found through a considerable effort that it does indeed happen to me. I discovered a lot of things about research in librarianship, in particular, and some of those ideas I would like to share with you today. Much of the research in librarianship, for children in particular, is descriptive. We've heard it before this morning and I'm repeating it again: telling us where we have been and what is happening now. There are a number of studies in the process of being completed that continue this necessary kind of descriptive activity. There is a dissertation in progress at the University of Wisconsin by Fanette Thomas for instance, soon to be completed on the history of children's libraries and the redoubtable women who organized them. Professor Benne's analysis of her jaunt to 29 libraries vividly describes at least some of the aspects of what life is really like in public libraries today, and projects for us some of the problems very specifically that we have to answer.

But social science research has been concerned for many years with the systematic behavior of human beings, with the regularization of social behavior through careful observation and measurement, to the discovery of relationships and the framing of models and theories. Measurement is the first step in such systematic observations and there is no reason why such activity cannot be measured in relation to library services to children. As children's librarians we have convinced ourselves of our success. Some of that conviction is shared by others. Both of our keynote speakers alluded to that comment in Robert Lee's Public Library Inquiry which I will note for you on page 109, paragraph 3, second sentence which quotes as the classic success of the public library, the children's story. But that study was completed in 1949/50 and we as children's librarians need to look for more success. Perhaps so does the public library. How many times have we raised our heads from story hours to relate a study, analyzing the development of listening skills to early socialization, to a harried director who says it isn't cost effective. An article noted in your bibliography by (Marion Gallivan. Research on children's services in libraries. Top of the News, April, 1974) suggests some of the difficulties in identifying research that is being done in the area of both school and public library services. But more significantly (Gallivan) notes a lack of substantive work going on at all. Incidentally that article is about three years old. It may be a good idea not only to up-date that but to consider a yearly review of research not only in our field but in allied fields that might be of interest to us.

Rather than describe for you my own work, which is in the tender formative stage and needs the security of friends and family rather than the glare of public comment, it might be more appropriate to specify or to restate for you three areas that I have found need close and careful evaluation; the close and careful scrutiny of research. We might begin with us, the children's librarian. How do we think of ourselves; how are we regarded by society. A society that designates us a helper or a caretaker of children. Societal views and attitudes towards low-class, low-status occupations have been measured by social scientists and documented, especially in the health professions. These studies are of great interest or should be of great interest to us who are concerned with what many consider a low-class, low-status occupation. Not to apply their findings and their research to children's librarianship or to librarianship in general is a mistake. We need to look at the training that we get and we three library educators are particularly interested in that kind of research. What is it in our background as children's librarians that prepares us or does not prepare us to articulate, evaluate and analyze the services that we provide. Are we from schools of education?

Are we English and History majors who didn't have another job? What does this kind of background and how does this kind of background affect what we do now?

The second area that I feel needs some significant research and has been mentioned by both Miss Fenwick and Dr. Summers are those in the institutions in which we operate. How we, all of us, apply the analytical models to our organization, and how we understand how these organizations and power works, makes our service not only cost effective but service effective. We need to understand the problems and processes of such obvious things as resource sharing and to be involved in the NCLIS studies as well, to be involved in the new recently appointed board from NCLIS to evaluate resource sharing in school libraries. Public libraries, especially those who work with children, very much need to be involved in that. Research needs to be done on how these kinds of things and how local government structures might be either changed or modified to allow such cooperation and such cooperative efforts to exist. Simply, the strictures of local government organization might very well be a study that could affect directly public library services. And as the old children's chant goes: first the worst, second the same but last the best of all the game. We need to know more about our client, the child, the little kid who steals two flowers for Mother's Day, one for his mother and one for you, the children's librarian. The person in whom we invest a lot of money both as a society and an institution. What do we really know about information needs of children? How do children find out about games and jump rope rhymes and wacky packs. From the library? Not hardly. How can we help children and other adults who care about them in finding out about themselves and the world in which they live? Does one have to wait for a rather grumpy battleheim to pay attention, to draw attention to the value of folklore and folktales to legitimatize our storytelling? Or, is it possible that the activities that we have spent our time with can indeed be legitimatized by their very nature by analyzing and measuring their effectiveness.

Let me tell you about some research that needs to be done. Once when I was working, and not teaching, I had a friend who was a teacher in a kind of experimental program in which she took a group of early learners, four and five year olds, wise in the ways of the street, to various activities in hopes that these kinds of enrichment activities would increase their learning abilities and their interest in learning. After they'd been to the harbor and the Lexington Market and the art gallery and the farm, they finally came to the library, and we had a fairly good time if I do say so myself, singing songs, looking at books, and finally sitting down to listen to a story. It was a story that they'd never heard before and they enjoyed it a lot. There was one little boy in the very first row that really is the reason that I continue to tell stories. He had sort of scruffy blond hair and big blue eyes. It was obvious that his mother cut his hair, probably with a bowl, but he moved a lot because his hair had a lot of jagged edges. He sat in the very front, right at my feet, and as I began the story which was, incidentally, about the three little pigs, his interest was caught from the very beginning. As the story went on, his eyes got even bigger it seemed, and he inched a little closer, and when the first little pig got eaten up by the wolf the little boy went, "Oh" and came even closer, and when the second pig met his fate the little boy gasped again. Now you know and I know that storytelling is not a dramatic art but with an audience like that, one can't help but respond to bid it. So with the fate of the third little pig hanging in the balance, I did indeed become dramatic. "And the third little pig stood in his house of stone quite firmly and when the wolf knocked at the door he huffed and he puffed and demanded to come in and the little pig said 'no, no, no' and the wolf said 'then I'll huff and I'll puff and I'll blow your house in' and the little boy said,'Jesus Christ, I wish somebody would kill that bastard.'" I don't suggest that that little boy's reaction and involvement in the story might well prove to be the basis of research, for although his expression was quite different, the involvement was the same. We need to know why and how we might capitalize on it, and we also need to know what to do with the storyteller.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROFESSION
(Name in parenthesis indicates discussion leader)

GROUP I (Faith Hektoen, Connecticut State Library)

1) Children's librarians must be advocates for strong public library service to children
   a) inside the library
   b) outside the library
2) Children's librarians must find ways to effectively measure their services to children.
3) The isolation of children's work within a library system must be altered.
4) There is a need for a national plan of cooperative research for schools and public libraries.

GROUP II (Barbara Miller, Louisville Free Public Library)

1) Library systems should identify the role of a children's librarian
   a) expand to include the role of manager
2) The library system, as a whole, must become more involved with the community
   a) internally - measure the effectiveness of service
   b) externally - involve the community in planning service

GROUP III (Betty Davis Miller, State Library of Florida)

1) Library administrators must bridge the communication gap between Children's Services Department and other library service departments
   a) in a linear way (from top management down to the children's librarian
   b) horizontally (from other departments and services to the children's department)
2) Library administrators should develop in-service training programs in management skills for children's librarians.
3) Library systems should involve the community in assessing what the library's contribution to the community might be.

GROUP IV (Sarah Ann Long, The Public Library of Columbus and Franklin County)

1) Children's librarians need to develop measurement techniques.
2) Children's librarians need to know more about children
   a) as users of the library
   b) as non-users of the library
3) The profession needs a national survey documenting library service
   a) to children
   b) to adults who work with children
4) Children's librarians need to know more about
   a) children and literacy
   b) informational needs of children

GROUP V (Selma K. Richardson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

1) Library systems must develop their own goals and objectives.
2) The profession needs new ways of measuring library service.
3) Children should be involved in any measurement/research survey.
4) Children's librarians need to communicate their services
   a) inside the library
   b) outside the library

GROUP VI (Virginia McKee, New Jersey State Library)

1) Library systems must define their functions.
2) Children's librarians must reach out to
   a) other community services who serve the children
   b) adults who serve the child
3) Children must be served by specialists
   a) children need someone who knows the materials
4) Program budgets for children should not be cut
   a) programs often reach non-library users

GROUP VII (Marguerite Baechtold, Western Michigan University)

1) The library profession needs research on the effectiveness of library service to children.
2) Children's librarians need
   a) training in management skills
   b) awareness of tools of management
3) Library administrators must be responsible for creating an environment for measurement of library service to children.
4) Library administrators must identify the role of coordinator of children's room.

GROUP VIII (Eleanor R. McKinney, Western Michigan University)

1) The library profession needs to measure and evaluate children's services in public libraries.
2) Administrator's should define the role of Coordinator of Children's Work.
3) Administrator should alleviate the traditional isolation of children's service staff from the rest of the library.
4) The library profession should re-affirm the rights of children as users of public libraries.
5) Children's librarians should
   a) emphasize reading for pleasure
   b) plan programs for the development of reading skills
6) Library schools should plan courses on the development of management skills
   a) especially for children's librarians.

Barbara Rollock: In summary, here are some thoughts to consider:

We have focused on children's services but everyone here has agreed that children's services is only a part of the total library picture. In the total picture libraries are a political reality and political priorities have to be considered. I think we all have to become politically astute. I see that as a recommendation not only for children's services people but certainly for library administrators.

The attitude of many of the children's services people today is one of self flagellation and my personal recommendation is, is that it's not all your fault, it's not all our fault. We must admit certain things however and that is the children's librarians don't always know enough about the patron they serve. That means that we don't even know enough about child development. We don't know about the certain skills that children need to acquire before they become users---permanent users---and eventually life-long users of the library.

The commitment to research was mentioned, and with it the question of the reliability of figures. Our higher administrative colleagues tell us that we don't document, we don't have figures, we don't measure. How reliable are figures? Someone mentioned the success of school libraries. The question is how successful indeed are these media centers today in the life of the political reality when the first cuts made actually took place in those media centers. How important were their quantitative measurements which they established to show us how it's supposed to be done. This needs to be considered as a reality when we talk about quantitative and qualitative standards. We need to define our own quantitative standards, too. And we must define that quality that we say is unique to children's services.

In closing, we need to discuss and probably measure and plan more in program areas. We need to develop other audiences as part of our services.